arXiv:hep-th/0701060v2 12 Feb 2009

hep-th/0701060

Five dimensional 2-branes and the universal hypermultiplet

Moataz H. Emam*

Department of Physics
SUNY College at Cortland
Cortland, NY 13045, USA

Abstract

We present a discussion of black 2-branes coupled to the fields of the universal hypermultiplet of ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity theory in five dimensions. Using a general ansatz dependent on a spherically symmetric harmonic function, we show that there are exactly two such solutions, both of which can be thought of as arising from the dimensional reduction of either M2- or M5-branes over special Lagrangian cycles of a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, confirming previous results. By relaxing some of the constraints on the ansatz, we proceed to find a more general solution carrying both M-brane charges and discuss its properties, as well as its relationship to Euclidean instantons.

---

*Electronic address: `moataz.emam@cortland.edu`

Contents

I Introduction **2**

II Five dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity **3**

III The main ansatz and other preliminaries **6**

IV An ansatz for the axions **8**

V The 2-brane with full UH fields **12**

VI The M-branes connection revisited **15**

VII Conclusion **17**

I Introduction

The search for nonperturbative solutions of string/supergravity theories is an open problem in theoretical physics with various important applications. For example interest in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ branes, our focus in this paper, soared in recent years because of their relevance to the conjectured equivalence between string theory on anti-de Sitter space and certain superconformal gauge theories living on the boundary of the space (the AdS/CFT duality) [1]. Some solitonic solutions in $D = 4, 5$ also allow for interpretation as the dimensional reduction of branes wrapping supersymmetric cycles of manifolds with restricted holonomy. For example, M-branes wrapping Kähler cycles of a Calabi-Yau 3-fold $\mathcal{M}$ [2] dimensionally reduce to black holes and strings coupled to the vector multiplets of five dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity [3], while M-branes wrapping special Lagrangian cycles reduce to configurations carrying charge under the hypermultiplet scalars [4, 5, 6, 7]. Studying how higher dimensional results are related to lower dimensional ones may eventually provide clues to the explicit structure of the compact space and the choice of compactification mechanism, thereby contributing to more understanding of the string theory landscape.

An abundance of work on gravitating solitonic solutions of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity (SUGRA) in four and five dimensions exist in the literature. One notes, however, that most of these study couplings with the vector multiplets sector (for example, see [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]). In contrast, hypermultiplets-coupled solutions are quite rare (*e.g.* [16, 17, 18, 19]). As such, this paper is one in a series intended to filling this gap as well as generalizing previous results [6].

The relative rarity of hypermultiplets-related work may be ascribed to the fact that the scalar fields of the hypermultiplets sector parameterize a quaternionic manifold, which is generally difficult to deal with. Luckily there exists a duality transformation, known as the c-map, which relates the $D = 5$ hypermultiplets' quaternionic structure to the more well understood $D = 4$ special Kähler structure parameterized by the four dimensional vector multiplets (*e.g.* [20, 21]). This means that one can use the techniques of special geometry, usually reserved for the vector multiplets, to study the hypermultiplets and classify their brane-coupled behavior. This was first performed in [22, 23], where instanton solutions of Euclidean $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 5$ supergravity were found using special geometry methods. The 2-branes we have studied in [6, 7], as well as the new result in this paper, are magnetically dual to these instantons. The general topic of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ instantons was studied in various sources (see [22] and the references within).

In [6] we found two solutions representing the coupling of 2-branes to the $D = 5$ universal hypermultiplet fields by dimensionally reducing particular M-brane configurations (which were constructed using the calibrations technique). In this paper, we re-derive these solutions using an ansatz based on a radial function satisfying the Laplace equation in the brane's transverse space. We demonstrate that these solutions are the only possible ones satisfying the ansatz and are characterized by the vanishing of either the M2- or M5-brane charges (inherited from $D = 11$ via dimensional reduction). We then proceed to generalize to a new solution carrying both charges and discuss some of its properties. We also note that changing certain choices leads to the dual Euclidean space solutions, *i.e.* instantons. This straightforwardly follows from the $(\text{Poincaré})_3 \times SO(2)$ invariance of the metric.

II Five dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity

The form of the ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity theory living in five dimensions may be understood in geometric terms by considering it as the dimensional reduction of $D = 11$ supergravity over supersymmetric cycles of a Calabi-Yau 3-fold $\mathcal{M}$. The resulting theory exhibits a surprisingly rich structure that follows directly from the intricate topology of the compact space. The matter content of the theory is composed of $(h_{1,1} - 1)$ vector multiplets and $(h_{2,1} + 1)$ hypermultiplets [24, 25, 26, 27, 28]; the h's being the Hodge numbers of $\mathcal{M}$. These two sectors decouple such that one may consistently set either one of them to zero. Furthermore, compactification over a rigid Calabi-Yau with constant complex structure moduli ($h_{2,1} = 0$) excites only the so-called universal hypermultiplet (UH), which is the only one we keep in our presentation. Throughout, we will use $\varepsilon_{M_1 M_2 \cdots M_D}$ to denote the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol such that $\varepsilon_{012\cdots} = +1$.

In what follows, we largely use the formulation of [22]. The bosonic fields of $D = 11$ supergravity theory are the metric and a 3-form gauge potential $\mathcal{A}$. The action is given by

$$S_{11} = \int_{11} \left(\mathcal{R} \star 1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F} \wedge \star \mathcal{F} - \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{F} \right), \tag{1}$$

where $\star$ is the Hodge duality operator. The $D = 5$ couplings of gravity to the universal hypermultiplet follow from eleven dimensional fields of the form

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{11} &= e^{\frac{2}{3}\sigma} g_{MN} dx^M dx^N + e^{-\frac{\sigma}{3}} ds^2_{CY}, \qquad M, N = 0, \ldots, 4 \\ \mathcal{A} &= \frac{1}{3!} A_{MNP} dx^M \wedge dx^N \wedge dx^P + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\chi \Omega + \bar{\chi} \bar{\Omega} \right) \\ \mathcal{F} &= d\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{4!} F_{LMNP} dx^L \wedge dx^M \wedge dx^N \wedge dx^P + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(d\chi \wedge \Omega + d\bar{\chi} \wedge \bar{\Omega} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where ds^2_{CY} is a fixed Ricci flat metric on the Calabi-Yau space $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω is the unique holomorphic 3-form on $\mathcal{M}$. The $D = 5$ fields of the universal hypermultiplet are the real overall volume modulus σ of the Calabi-Yau space, the $D = 5$ 3-form gauge potential A and the pseudo-scalar axions $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$, assumed conjugate to each other. The dual to A is a scalar field known as the universal axion a. The UH scalars $(\sigma, a, \chi, \bar{\chi})$ parameterize the quaternionic manifold $SU(2,1)/U(2)$ [29, 30]. The $D = 5$ action is then found to be (dimensional reduction detailed in [31]):

$$S_5 = \int\limits_5 \left[R \star 1 - \frac{1}{2} d\sigma \wedge \star d\sigma - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\sigma} F \wedge \star F - e^{\sigma} d\chi \wedge \star d\bar{\chi} - \frac{i}{2} F \wedge \left(\chi d\bar{\chi} - \bar{\chi} d\chi \right) \right]. \tag{3}$$

The equations of motion of σ, A and $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ are, respectively:

$$(\Delta\sigma) \star 1 - e^{\sigma} d\chi \wedge \star d\bar{\chi} + e^{-2\sigma} F \wedge \star F = 0 \tag{4}$$

$$d^{\dagger} \left[e^{-2\sigma} F + \frac{i}{2} \star \left(\chi d\bar{\chi} - \bar{\chi} d\chi \right) \right] = 0 \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d^{\dagger} \left[e^{\sigma} d\chi + i\chi \star F \right] &= 0 \\ d^{\dagger} \left[e^{\sigma} d\bar{\chi} - i\bar{\chi} \star F \right] &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $d^{\dagger}$ is the adjoint exterior derivative, Δ is the Laplace-De Rahm operator and the Bianchi identity $dF = 0$ was used to simplify (6). The form of equations (5) and (6) is suggestive. It implies that the quantities inside the derivatives are conserved currents:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_2 &= e^{-2\sigma}F + \frac{i}{2}\star(\chi d\bar{\chi} - \bar{\chi}d\chi) \\ \mathcal{J}_5 &= e^{\sigma}d\chi + i\chi\star F, \qquad \bar{\mathcal{J}}_5 = e^{\sigma}d\bar{\chi} - i\bar{\chi}\star F. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

These are, in fact, conserved Noether currents. The charges associated with them are found in the usual way by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_2 &= \int \mathcal{J}_2, \\ \mathcal{Q}_5 &= \int \mathcal{J}_5, \qquad \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_5 = \int \bar{\mathcal{J}}_5. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

These charges (more accurately charge *densities*) correspond to certain isometries of the quaternionic manifold $SU(2,1)/U(2)$ as discussed in various sources [29, 30]. From a five dimensional perspective, they can be thought of as the result of the invariance of the action under certain infinitesimal shifts of A and $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ [22, 23]. The geometric way of understanding these charges is in noting that they descend from the eleven dimensional electric and magnetic M-brane charges, hence the $(2,5)$ labels[1]. M2-branes wrapping special Lagrangian cycles of $\mathcal{M}$ generate $\mathcal{Q}_2$ while the wrapping of M5-branes results in non-vanishing $(\mathcal{Q}_5, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_5)$.

Finally, the full action is invariant under the following set of supersymmetry (SUSY) variations:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\epsilon\psi^1 &= D\epsilon_1 + \frac{i}{4}e^{-\sigma}\star F\epsilon_1 - \frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}d\chi\epsilon_2 \\ \delta_\epsilon\psi^2 &= D\epsilon_2 - \frac{i}{4}e^{-\sigma}\star F\epsilon_2 + \frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}d\bar{\chi}\epsilon_1 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\epsilon\xi_1 &= \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_M\sigma) - ie^{-\sigma}(\star F)_M\right]\Gamma^M\epsilon_1 + \frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_M\chi)\Gamma^M\epsilon_2 \\ \delta_\epsilon\xi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_M\sigma) + ie^{-\sigma}(\star F)_M\right]\Gamma^M\epsilon_2 - \frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_M\bar{\chi})\Gamma^M\epsilon_1, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where

$$D = dx^M\left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{\hat{M}\hat{N}}\Gamma_{\hat{M}\hat{N}}\right) \tag{11}$$

as usual, ψ and ξ are the gravitini and hyperini fermions respectively, the ϵ's are the $\mathcal{N}=2$ SUSY spinors, ω is the spin connection and the hatted indices are frame indices in a flat tangent space.

---

[1] This is the reverse situation to that of [22], where the (dual) Euclidean theory was studied.

III The main ansatz and other preliminaries

The most general form of a metric satisfying (Poincaré)$_3 \times SO\left(2\right)$ invariance in $D=5$ is:

$$ds^2 = e^{2C\sigma(r)}\eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{2B\sigma(r)}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \qquad a,b=0,1,2 \qquad \mu,\nu=3,4 \tag{12}$$

where C and B are constants, (x^1,x^2) define the directions tangent to the brane and (x^3,x^4) those transverse to it. From the point of view of the (x^3,x^4) plane, the brane appears as a point and one may construct ordinary polar coordinates (r,θ) in the plane with the brane at the origin, such that $r=\left(\delta^{\mu\nu}x_\mu x_\nu\right)^{1/2}$ and $\tan\theta = x_4/x_3$. It turns out that the constant C is constrained to vanish by both the Einstein equations and the SUSY condition[2] $\delta\psi=0$. We then set $C=0$ from the start:

$$ds^2 = \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{2B\sigma(r)}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu. \tag{13}$$

We also adopt the following form for F throughout:

$$F = \frac{\kappa}{3!}\varepsilon_{abc}f_\mu{}^\nu\left(\partial_\nu H^m\right)dx^\mu\wedge dx^a\wedge dx^b\wedge dx^c, \tag{14}$$

where m and κ are real constants to be determined, $f_\mu{}^\nu$ is either δ_μ^ν or $\varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu$ and the radial function $H(r)$ is assumed harmonic in the transverse directions; *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta H &= \delta^{\mu\nu}\left(\partial_\mu\partial_\nu H\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r\frac{dH}{dr}\right)=0 \\ \rightarrow \quad H\left(r\right) &= 1+q\ln r. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Here q is related to the charges of the dimensionally reduced M-branes and we have chosen $H\left(1\right)=1$ for simplicity. We note as well that it is possible to generalize this ansatz to a multi-centered solution simply by redefining:

$$H\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i\right) = 1+\sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \ln\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i\right|, \tag{16}$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ is the position vector in the (x^3,x^4) plane and $\mathbf{x}_i$ are the position vectors of a number N of 2-branes, each carrying a charge q_i. The presence of harmonic functions is well understood in the literature as characteristic of supersymmetric Bogomol'nyi-Prasad-Sommerfield (BPS) solutions, making the harmonic condition a desirable property. They also indicate that the multi-centered version of the solution satisfies a Newtonian 'no-force' condition (an example in the case of five dimensional black holes is [33]). In this work, however, we will restrict ourselves to studying single-centered solutions.

---

[2] This is no surprise, since $\delta\psi=0$ automatically satisfies $G_{MN}=8\pi T_{MN}$ [32].

Demanding that (14) satisfies the Bianchi identity $dF = 0$ leads to:

$$\kappa\,(m-1)\,\varepsilon^{\mu\alpha} f_{\alpha}{}^{\nu}\,(\partial_\mu \ln H)\,(\partial_\nu \ln H) = 0, \tag{17}$$

which, for nonvanishing κ, is identically satisfied for the choice $f_\mu{}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$ but requires $m = 1$ for $f_\mu{}^\nu = \varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu$. Now, consider the field equation (5). The second term vanishes as a consequence of the Bianchi identities on $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ as well as

$$d\chi \wedge d\bar{\chi} = 0, \tag{18}$$

while the first term leads to

$$\begin{aligned} d \star F - 2 d\sigma \wedge \star F &= 0 \\ \kappa f^{\mu\nu} x_\mu x_\nu \left[(m-1)\frac{q}{rH} - 2\frac{d\sigma}{dr}\right] &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the assumption for a radial dilaton (13) was used. Once again assuming nonvanishing κ (19) is identically satisfied for the choice $f_\mu{}^\nu = \varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu$. However for $f_\mu{}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$ it yields a first order differential equation for σ with the solution:

$$\sigma(r) = \frac{1}{2}(m-1)\ln H, \tag{20}$$

where we have chosen $\sigma(1) = 0$ for simplicity. We then generally assume the following form for the dilaton

$$\sigma(r) = n \ln H, \tag{21}$$

where n is a constant that is equal to $\frac{1}{2}(m-1)$ only for $\kappa \neq 0$ and $f_\mu{}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$.

The solutions we seek are black 2-branes satisfying the BPS condition, breaking half of the supersymmetries of the theory. This is guaranteed by the vanishing of the variation of gravitini and hyperini backgrounds, *i.e.* $\delta\psi = 0$ and $\delta\xi = 0$. In addition, we will use the remaining UH field equations and Einstein's equations $G_{MN} = 8\pi T_{MN}$ to find constraints on the unknown constants in the ansatz as well as the form of the axions $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$. The bits and pieces we will need are as follows: The fünfbeins and Christoffel symbols are:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\hat{a}}{}_{b} &= \eta^{\hat{a}}_{b}, \qquad\qquad e^{\hat{\mu}}{}_{\nu} = e^{B\sigma}\delta^{\hat{\mu}}_{\nu} \\ \Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} &= B\left[\delta^{\mu}_{\nu}(\partial_\rho\sigma) + \delta^{\mu}_{\rho}(\partial_\nu\sigma) - \delta_{\nu\rho}\delta^{\mu\alpha}(\partial_\alpha\sigma)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

resulting in the following spin connections and covariant derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\alpha}{}^{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} &= B\left(\delta^{\hat{\beta}}_{\alpha}\delta^{\hat{\gamma}\rho} - \delta^{\hat{\beta}\rho}\delta^{\hat{\gamma}}_{\alpha}\right)(\partial_\rho\sigma) \\
D_a &= \partial_a \\
D_\mu &= \partial_\mu + \frac{B}{2}(\partial_\nu\sigma)\Gamma_\mu{}^\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

as well as the Dirac matrices projection conditions[3]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}}\epsilon_s &= b_s\varepsilon_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}}\epsilon_s, & s &= (1,2), \quad b_s = \pm i \\
\Gamma_\mu{}^\nu\epsilon_s &= b_s\varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu\epsilon_s, & \Gamma^\mu\epsilon_s &= -b_s\varepsilon_\nu{}^\mu\Gamma^\nu\epsilon_s.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Finally, the Einstein equations have the following components:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{ab} &= B\eta_{ab}g^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\sigma), \qquad\qquad G_{\mu\nu} = 0 \\
8\pi T_{ab} &= -\frac{1}{4}\eta_{ab}(\partial^\mu\sigma)(\partial_\mu\sigma) + \frac{1}{4}e^{-2\sigma}F_{\mu dca}F^{\mu dc}{}_b - \frac{1}{24}e^{-2\sigma}\eta_{ab}F_{\mu dce}F^{\mu dce} - \frac{1}{2}e^{\sigma}\eta_{ab}(\partial^\mu\chi)(\partial_\mu\bar{\chi}) \\
8\pi T_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma)(\partial_\nu\sigma) - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}(\partial^\alpha\sigma)(\partial_\alpha\sigma) + \frac{1}{12}e^{-2\sigma}F_{\mu abc}F_\nu{}^{abc} - \frac{1}{24}e^{-2\sigma}g_{\mu\nu}F_{\alpha abc}F^{\alpha abc} \\
&\quad + e^{\sigma}(\partial_\mu\chi)(\partial_\nu\bar{\chi}) - \frac{1}{2}e^{\sigma}g_{\mu\nu}(\partial^\alpha\chi)(\partial_\alpha\bar{\chi}).
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

IV An ansatz for the axions

In this section we assume the form of the axion fields $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ to be:

$$d\chi = \omega l_\mu{}^\nu(\partial_\nu H^p)dx^\mu, \qquad d\bar{\chi} = \bar{\omega} l_\mu{}^\nu(\partial_\nu H^p)dx^\mu, \tag{26}$$

where p and the complex ω are constants to be determined and $l_\mu{}^\nu$ is either δ^ν_μ or $\varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu$. We will derive all the possible solutions that satisfy this assumption. This will include both 2-brane solutions as well as the dual instanton solutions. It is straightforward to check that (26) trivially satisfies (18). We now systematically go through the remaining field equations, inserting the ansätze (14, 21, 26) and keeping track of the cases that arise due to the specific choices of $f_\mu{}^\nu$ and $l_\mu{}^\nu$. The Bianchi identity $d^2\chi = 0$ gives

$$\omega(p-1)\varepsilon^{\mu\alpha}l_\alpha{}^\nu(\partial_\mu\ln H)(\partial_\nu\ln H) = 0, \tag{27}$$

which is satisfied identically if $l_\mu{}^\nu = \delta^\nu_\mu$ but requires

$$\omega(p-1) = 0 \tag{28}$$

---

[3] The Einstein summation convention is *not* used over the index s.

for ${l_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$. The σ equation of motion (4) gives:

$$n\delta^{\mu\nu}\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right) + m^2\kappa^2 H^{2(m-n)}\delta^{\mu\nu}\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right)$$
$$+p^2\left|\omega\right|^2 H^{(n+2p)}\delta^{\mu\nu}\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right) = 0, \tag{29}$$

irrespective of the choice of ${f_\mu}^\nu$ and ${l_\mu}^\nu$. This is clearly satisfied provided that:

$$\begin{aligned} &m = n, \\ &p = -\frac{n}{2} \\ &n + m^2\kappa^2 + p^2\left|\omega\right|^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Combining all three conditions together, we get the algebraic constraint[4]:

$$1 + n\kappa^2 + \frac{n}{4}\left|\omega\right|^2 = 0. \tag{31}$$

The χ field equation (6) yields:

$$\omega\left(n-2\right)l^{\mu\nu}\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right)$$
$$+i2n\omega\kappa\left(\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}f^{\alpha\mu}l^{\beta\nu}\right)\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right) = 0, \tag{32}$$

with a similar equation for $\bar{\chi}$. The conditions for (32) to be satisfied depend on ${f_\mu}^\nu$ and ${l_\mu}^\nu$ in the following way:

1. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {l_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$: Identically satisfied
2. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {l_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$: $\omega\left(n-2\right) = 0$
3. ${f_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$, ${l_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$: $\omega\kappa = 0$
4. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$, ${l_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$: $\omega\left(n-2\right) = \omega\kappa = 0$

Next, the Einstein equation $G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab}$ is satisfied for any choice of ${f_\mu}^\nu$ and ${l_\mu}^\nu$ if:

$$B = \frac{n}{4}\left(1 + \kappa^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left|\omega\right|^2\right), \tag{33}$$

while $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$ results in:

$$\frac{n^2}{2}\left(\partial_\mu \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\nu \ln H\right) - \frac{n^2}{4}\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^{\alpha\beta}\left(\partial_\alpha \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\beta \ln H\right)$$
$$+\frac{1}{4}m^2\kappa^2\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^{\alpha\beta}\left(\partial_\alpha \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\beta \ln H\right) - \frac{1}{2}p^2\left|\omega\right|^2\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^{\alpha\beta}\left(\partial_\alpha \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\beta \ln H\right)$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}m^2\kappa^2{f_\mu}^\alpha{f_\nu}^\beta\left(\partial_\alpha \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\beta \ln H\right) + p^2\left|\omega\right|^2{l_\mu}^\alpha{l_\nu}^\beta\left(\partial_\alpha \ln H\right)\left(\partial_\beta \ln H\right) = 0. \tag{34}$$

---

[4] Excluding the trivial case $n = 0$, which simply gives the flat Minkowski spacetime with vanishing hypermultiplets.

This equation yields four algebraic conditions corresponding to the possibilities:

1. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {l_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$: $1+\kappa^2-\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2=0$
2. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {l_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$: $1-\kappa^2+\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2=0$
3. ${f_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$, ${l_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$: $1-\kappa^2-\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2=0$
4. ${f_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$, ${l_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$: $1+\kappa^2+\frac{1}{2}|\omega|^2=0$

We now solve all the algebraic conditions under the four possible combinations of ${f_\mu}^\nu$ and ${l_\mu}^\nu$. We choose the complex representation $\omega = be^{i\varphi}$, where b is a real constant and φ is an arbitrary phase and demand that $\kappa = \bar{\kappa}$ to ensure the reality of F. We find *exactly* two possibilities:

2-brane with constant axions

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{-\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \\
\sigma &= -\ln H, \qquad d\chi = d\bar{\chi} = 0 \\
F &= \pm\left(\partial_\mu H^{-1}\right) dt\wedge dx^1\wedge dx^2\wedge dx^\mu, \\
\rightarrow A &= \pm\frac{1}{H}dt\wedge dx^1\wedge dx^2, \qquad\qquad (\chi,\bar{\chi}) = \text{constants}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

2-brane with constant 3-form field

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{-2\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \\
\sigma &= -2\ln H, \qquad F=0, \qquad A = \text{constant} \\
d\chi &= \pm\sqrt{2}{\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu\left(\partial_\nu H\right)e^{+i\varphi}dx^\mu, \qquad d\bar{\chi} = \pm\sqrt{2}{\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu\left(\partial_\nu H\right)e^{-i\varphi}dx^\mu, \\
\rightarrow \chi &= \pm\sqrt{2}qe^{i\varphi}\theta, \qquad \bar{\chi} = \pm\sqrt{2}qe^{-i\varphi}\theta.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

It is straightforward to verify that the conditions $\delta\psi = \delta\xi = 0$ are satisfied if the SUSY spinors (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) are constant in both cases. Solutions (35) and (36) are exactly the ones we found in reference [6] as the result of the dimensional reduction of wrapped M-branes and are the *only* 2-brane possibilities satisfying the ansätze (14, 21, 26). We have discussed the M-brane connection in more detail in [6] and [7] (as well as [31]). In the first reference in particular, it was explicitly shown that the dimensional reduction of a single M2-brane down to five dimensions over a rigid Calabi-Yau manifold ($h_{2,1}=0$) gives exactly the solution (35), while the dimensional reduction of a certain M5-brane configuration yields the solution (36)[5]. It is clear from the calculations in this section that these are the only possible 2-brane solutions if one insists on applying the dependence on H to all the UH fields. To find a solution with non-vanishing fields we will have to relax this condition, which we will do in the next section.

Finally, we note that if the conditions $\kappa = \bar{\kappa}$ and $b = \bar{b}$ are relaxed then there exist two more solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{MN} dx^M dx^N, \\ \sigma &= \ln H, \quad d\chi = d\bar{\chi} = 0 \\ F &= \pm i \varepsilon_\mu{}^\nu \left(\partial_\nu H\right) dt \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^\mu, \\ \rightarrow A &= \pm i q \theta \, dt \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2, \qquad (\chi, \bar{\chi}) = \text{constants}, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{MN} dx^M dx^N, \\ \sigma &= 2 \ln H, \qquad F = 0 \\ d\chi &= \pm i\sqrt{2} \left(\partial_\mu H^{-1}\right) e^{+i\varphi} dx^\mu, \qquad d\bar{\chi} = \pm i\sqrt{2} \left(\partial_\mu H^{-1}\right) e^{-i\varphi} dx^\mu \\ \rightarrow \chi &= \pm i \frac{\sqrt{2}}{H} e^{i\varphi}, \qquad \bar{\chi} = \pm i \frac{\sqrt{2}}{H} e^{-i\varphi}, \qquad A = \text{constant}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

These are clearly not 2-branes but rather Minkowski space representations of Euclidean solutions of the theory, *i.e.* instantons; as can be verified by performing a Wick rotation $t \rightarrow ix^0$ on them and allowing the function H to be harmonic in all five dimensional Euclidean space (which also restores the reality of F in the first result). Such UH-coupled instantons have been extensively studied in the literature, particularly for $D = 4$ (see for example [34, 35, 36, 37]). The first solution (37) is the result of the dimensional reduction of Euclidean M5-branes over a rigid $\mathcal{M}$ and (38) is the dimensional reduction of Euclidean M2-branes. Solutions (37) and (38) are then just the Minkowski space representations of these instantons and are magnetically dual to the 2-branes (35) and (36). The $D = 4$ instantons of [34] are similar and should arise as the dimensional reduction of (37) and (38) over S^1.

---

[5] In [6], however, the choice $\varphi = \pi/2$ was used.

V The 2-brane with full UH fields

In the previous section it was shown that assuming the ansatz (26) fails to deliver a solution with non-vanishing UH fields. We now relax (26) while keeping the analysis of §III. Based on the form of the solutions (35), (36), (37) and (38), we expect that the choice ${f_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$ will lead to a 2-brane configuration generalizing (35), while ${f_\mu}^\nu = {\varepsilon_\mu}^\nu$ would result in an instanton solution[6]. We then set

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{ab} dx^a dx^b + e^{-\sigma} \delta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu, \qquad\qquad \sigma = -\ln H \\ F &= \pm \left(\partial_\mu H^{-1}\right) dt \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and are only left with finding the form of the non-constant axions. First, we consider the Einstein equations $G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab}$ and $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$, both of which lead to

$$d\sigma \wedge \star d\sigma + e^{-2\sigma} F \wedge \star F + 2e^{\sigma} d\chi \wedge \star d\bar{\chi} = 0, \tag{40}$$

yielding

$$d\chi \wedge \star d\bar{\chi} = 0. \tag{41}$$

We also note that the dilaton equation (4) leads to (41) as well. It can be shown that it is impossible to satisfy (41) simultaneously with (18), which guarantees (5), if one insists that the axions $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ are complex conjugate to each other. However, this problem is solved if one assumes that they are *split*-complex conjugate. In other words:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \chi_1 + j\chi_2 \\ \bar{\chi} &= \chi_1 - j\chi_2, \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where (χ_1, χ_2) are functions in the transverse plane and the "imaginary" number j is defined by $j^2 = +1$ and is *not* equal to ±1. Split-complex numbers[7] are a generalization of ordinary complex numbers satisfying the 'hyperbolic' scalar product:

$$|\chi|^2 = \chi_1^2 - \chi_2^2. \tag{43}$$

---

[6] This, in fact, leads to the solution found in [22], which reduces to (37) for vanishing axions.

[7] Also known as 'para-complex numbers', 'real tessarines', 'algebraic motors', 'hyperbolic complex numbers', 'double numbers', 'perplex numbers', 'Lorentz numbers', and several others.

In contrast to the complex numbers, which form a field, the split-complex numbers form a ring. They have the interesting property, absent from the complex numbers, of containing non-trivial idempotents (other than 0 and 1), where an idempotent Z is defined by $Z^2 = Z$. This property can be used to define the so-called diagonal, or null, basis:

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \frac{1}{2}(1+j) \\ \bar{e} &= \frac{1}{2}(1-j), \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

such that any split-complex quantity, such as our axion fields, can be written in the form:

$$\chi = (\chi_1 + \chi_2)\, e + (\chi_1 - \chi_2)\, \bar{e} \tag{45}$$

$$\bar{\chi} = (\chi_1 - \chi_2)\, e + (\chi_1 + \chi_2)\, \bar{e}, \tag{46}$$

where e is idempotent as well as null, *i.e.* $|e|^2 = e\bar{e} = 0$. One can also demonstrate the interesting property (which we will use in the next section):

$$\frac{1}{e} = \frac{1}{\bar{e}} = 1. \tag{47}$$

Equations (41) and (18) further require that $\chi_1 = \chi_2$, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= 2e\chi_1 \\ \bar{\chi} &= 2\bar{e}\chi_1, \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

which means that $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$ are themselves null split-complex fields. It is this last fact that allows for (41) and (18) to be simultaneously satisfied. It is interesting to note that split-complex structures have been shown to naturally arise in the context of hypermultiplet couplings obeying Euclidean supersymmetry (see *e.g.* [38] and the references within). The connection between this and the explicit solution found here might be a worthwhile problem to pursue.

We are now left with finding the explicit form of the real function $\chi_1(r, \theta)$. This is straightforwardly found by looking at the χ field equation (6), which gives

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r\frac{\partial \chi_1}{\partial r}\right) + \frac{1}{r^2}\left(\frac{\partial^2 \chi_1}{\partial \theta^2}\right) = \frac{q}{Hr}\left[\left(\frac{\partial \chi_1}{\partial r}\right) + \frac{i}{r}\left(\frac{\partial \chi_1}{\partial \theta}\right)\right]. \tag{49}$$

This clearly implies that

$$\frac{\partial \chi_1}{\partial \theta} = 0. \tag{50}$$

The remaining radial equation is then readily integrated to give:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \chi_0 H^2 e \\ \bar{\chi} &= \chi_0 H^2 \bar{e}, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where the factor of 2 was absorbed in the arbitrary integration constant χ_0. Note that the axion fields are asymptomatically well-behaved since $(d\chi, d\bar{\chi}) \propto H/r$; slowly converging to a finite value.

Finally, we look at the SUSY variations. Using (10), the condition $\delta\xi = 0$ can be written in the matrix form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_\mu \sigma) - ie^{-\sigma}\left(\star F\right)_\mu\right]\Gamma^\mu & \frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\partial_\mu \chi\right)\Gamma^\mu \\ -\frac{e^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\partial_\nu \bar{\chi}\right)\Gamma^\nu & \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_\nu \sigma) + ie^{-\sigma}\left(\star F\right)_\nu\right]\Gamma^\nu \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 \\ \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{52}$$

which is true if and only if the determinant of the given matrix vanishes:

$$d\sigma \wedge \star d\sigma + e^{-2\sigma} F \wedge \star F + 2e^{\sigma} d\chi \wedge \star d\bar{\chi} = 0. \tag{53}$$

This is exactly equation (40) which we already know is satisfied. The condition $\delta\xi = 0$ can further be used to uncouple the two $\delta\psi = 0$ equations, leading to first order differential equations in the spinors:

$$\begin{aligned} D\epsilon_1 + \frac{1}{2} d\sigma \epsilon_1 - \frac{i}{4} e^{-\sigma}\left(\star F\right)\epsilon_1 &= 0 \\ D\epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2} d\sigma \epsilon_2 + \frac{i}{4} e^{-\sigma}\left(\star F\right)\epsilon_2 &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

resulting in

$$\left(\frac{d\epsilon_s}{dr}\right) = \frac{q}{2Hr}\epsilon_s \qquad s = 1, 2, \tag{55}$$

which is straightforwardly solved by $\epsilon_s = H^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\epsilon}_s$, where $(\hat{\epsilon}_1, \hat{\epsilon}_2)$ are constant spinors.

To summarize, the complete solution representing the coupling of a 2-brane to the full set of non-vanishing universal hypermultiplet fields in $D = 5$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{ab} dx^a dx^b + e^{-\sigma} \delta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu, \qquad \sigma = -\ln H \\ A &= \pm \frac{1}{H} dt \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2, \\ \chi &= \chi_0 H^2 e \qquad \text{where} \quad e = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + j\right), \quad \bar{e} = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - j\right), \\ \bar{\chi} &= \chi_0 H^2 \bar{e}, \qquad \text{and} \quad j^2 = +1, \quad j \neq \pm 1. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

This clearly reduces to (35) if $\chi_0 = 0$ as required.

At this point, a natural question to ask is whether or not one can find another solution with non-vanishing UH fields that reduces to (36) if $F = 0$. One can show that this, in fact, is not possible. The reason is that if one assumes such a solution existed then equation (40) necessarily leads to

$$F \wedge \star F = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial r}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{r^2}\left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial \theta}\right)^2 = 0, \tag{57}$$

implying that A is not real. This is a contradiction and one concludes that a more general solution, exactly reducing to (36) as a special case, does not exist. However, it should be clear that relaxing the condition of the reality of F and proceeding from (57) one should arrive at an instanton solution that reduces to (38) for vanishing F. As before, the reality of F would be restored in Euclidean space.

VI The M-branes connection revisited

In order to emphasize the geometric meaning of the results discussed in this paper, we further analyze their interpretation as the dimensional reduction of M-brane configurations. The M-brane charges, excited by these reductions, are calculable via (8). Note however, that an interesting property of the 2-branes (35), (36) and (56) is that they are asymptotically non-flat! This phenomenon is known to arise for p-branes where $p = D-3, D-2$ and such solutions have been dubbed 'high branes' [39]. As such, it does not make much sense to talk about the 'total' charge of the brane, since the integrals of (8) would necessarily diverge if carried over the entire transverse space. In what follows then, we calculate the M-brane charges using specific choices of integration constants, with the sole purpose of relating $(\mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{Q}_5)$ to the dilaton charge q in the simplest possible way. We will use non-script (Q_2, Q_5) to denote the charges with these choices of constants.

As discussed in [6], (35) is the result of reducing a single M2-brane to $D = 5$ using the scheme

$$t \quad 1 \quad 2 \;\Big|\; 3 \quad 4 \;\Big|\; \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \tag{58}$$

where $(t, 1, 2)$ represent the world-volume directions of the brane, $(3, 4)$ the transverse directions and the six dimensions denoted by $\bullet$ represent those wrapped completely over a T^6. Calculating the M2-brane charge via (8) leads to the simple relation

$$Q_2 = \pm q, \tag{59}$$

and of course Q_5 vanishes. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{-\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \\ \sigma &= -\ln\left(1+q\ln r\right) \\ A &= \frac{1}{1+Q_2\ln r}dt\wedge dx^1\wedge dx^2, \qquad (\chi,\bar{\chi}) = \text{constants.} \end{aligned} \qquad (60)$$

Solution (36), on the other hand, is slightly more complex since it arises from the dimensional reduction of a system of 4 intersecting M5-branes as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc|cc|cccccc} t & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ t & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & 9 & 10 \\ t & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \bullet & 6 & \bullet & 8 & \bullet & 10 \\ t & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \bullet & \bullet & 7 & 8 & 9 & \bullet \end{array} \qquad (61)$$

Note that each two M5-branes intersect on a 1-brane and that three directions of each M5-brane end up completely wrapped over 3-cycles of the Calabi-Yau, which are taken to be special Lagrangian. The Q_2 charge vanishes and we find:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_5 &= \pm 2\pi\sqrt{2}qe^{i\varphi}, \\ \bar{Q}_5 &= \pm 2\pi\sqrt{2}qe^{-i\varphi}, \end{aligned} \qquad (62)$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{-2\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \\ \sigma &= -2\ln(1+q\ln r), \\ \chi &= \frac{Q_5}{2\pi}\theta, \\ \bar{\chi} &= \frac{\bar{Q}_5}{2\pi}\theta, \qquad A = \text{constant.} \end{aligned} \qquad (63)$$

The fact that one cannot find a more general solution with non-vanishing charges that reduces to (63) can be explained in the following way: Such a solution, if it existed, would have the $D=11$ interpretation as the intersection of four M5-branes and at least one wrapped M2-brane. Chart (61) implies, however, that there is no room left for M2-branes. If the $D=11$ parent configuration does not exist, then the $D=5$ offspring wouldn't either, as we found in the previous section.

Finally, we look at (56). The M-brane charges are found to be:

$$Q_2 = \pm q$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_5 &= \pm 2q\chi_0 e\,(1-i\pi)\\
\bar{Q}_5 &= \pm 2q\chi_0 \bar{e}\,(1+i\pi)\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{64}
$$

Note that the M5-brane charges $\left(Q_5, \bar{Q}_5\right)$ are both complex *and* null split-complex. Re-writing χ_0 in terms of the M-brane charges and using (47), (56) becomes:

$$
\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \eta_{ab}dx^a dx^b + e^{-\sigma}\delta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \qquad \sigma = -\ln\left(1+q\ln r\right)\\
A &= \pm\frac{1}{\left(1+Q_2\ln r\right)}dt\wedge dx^1\wedge dx^2,\\
\chi &= \pm\frac{Q_5}{Q_2}\frac{e\,(1+i\pi)}{2\,(1+\pi^2)}\left(1+Q_2\ln r\right)^2\\
\bar{\chi} &= \pm\frac{\bar{Q}_5}{Q_2}\frac{\bar{e}\,(1-i\pi)}{2\,(1+\pi^2)}\left(1+Q_2\ln r\right)^2,\\
&\quad \text{where}\quad e=\frac{1}{2}\left(1+j\right), \quad \bar{e}=\frac{1}{2}\left(1-j\right)\\
&\quad \text{and}\quad j^2=+1, \quad j\neq\pm1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{65}
$$

Solution (56/65) then represents the dimensional reduction of some configuration of wrapped M2- and M5-branes. Finding this configuration is an interesting problem in its own right. It might be, however, that it is already partially known. In [40], a solution representing the coupling of (unwrapped) M2- and M5-branes was found (with further discussion in [41]). In their analysis, the $D=11$ metric and 4-form field $\mathcal{F}$ are dependent on an arbitrary phase angle α such that the choice $\cos\alpha=0$ reduces the solution to a pure M2-brane whereas $\sin\alpha=0$ gives the ordinary M5-brane. We suspect then that there exists an eleven dimensional solution that represents the wrapping of this dyonic state over special Lagrangian cycles of $\mathcal{M}$ such that, upon dimensional reduction, it yields (56). This, however, is a question for future pondering.

VII Conclusion

We presented a detailed analysis of the coupling of supersymmetric BPS 2-brane sources to the universal hypermultiplet fields of five dimensional $\mathcal{N}=2$ SUGRA. These solutions can be thought of as the dimensional reduction of certain M-brane configurations over special Lagrangian cycles of a rigid Calabi-Yau 3-fold. Two of the solutions discussed carry only one of the two possible M-brane charges and were shown to be the only solutions satisfying both (Poincaré)$_3$ × $SO\left(2\right)$ as well as the dependence on a purely radial harmonic function (barring instanton solutions of the Euclidean form of the theory). We then generalized one of these solutions to one representing the dimensional reduction of a coupled M2/M5 brane configuration and explicitly calculated the M-brane charges.

There are several possible paths that one can tread from here. For example, finding the eleven dimensional dyonic M2/M5 brane configuration that dimensionally reduces to (56/65) would be interesting. As mentioned, a starting point could be the solution of [40]. One may also generalize our result to include an arbitrary number of hypermultiplet fields (*i.e.* $h_{2,1} \neq 0$) in the spirit of [6] and [23], and/or find its eleven dimensional counterpart. Clearly these possibilities are intertwined and one may easily lead to the other. An obvious obstacle would be the fact that explicit forms of compact non-rigid Calabi-Yau manifolds do not yet exist. In other words any $h_{2,1} \neq 0$ configuration will necessarily depend on unknown functions representing the complex structure moduli and other metric-dependent properties of $\mathcal{M}$. Despite this, one can still deduce a variety of conclusions from the general form of the differential equations governing the unknown functions, as well as further understand Calabi-Yau compactifications (see *e.g.* [3] and [7]). Furthermore, constructing wrapped M-branes may require invoking the theory of generalized calibrations; an approach that is interesting in its own right (*e.g.* [2]).

Even without reference to higher dimensional sources, one can still find open questions to tackle for hypermultiplets-coupled branes. For instance, it would be interesting to further explore the properties of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ branes as high branes. Also, aside from the appearance of split-complex structures in Euclidean supersymmetry [38], the use of split-complex quantities to construct an explicit supergravity solution is, to this author's knowledge, unprecedented. One could further explore the origins of this, its connection to Euclidean supersymmetry, as well as its physical implications, if any. Another possibility, one more in tune with our earlier comment that hypermultiplets-related research is lacking in the literature, would be to write down general ansätze for five dimensional p-branes satisfying $(\text{Poincaré})_{p+1} \times SO\left(D-p-1\right)$ invariance and study the general properties of such metrics and how they can couple to the UH fields or, more ambitiously, to the full hypermultiplets sector. Some work in this direction already exists [42], [43]. This is particularly interesting in the context of classifying p-branes in supergravity. In the future, we plan to continue explorations in at least some of the above possibilities.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to my friend and colleague Mohamed Anber for useful discussions and advice.

References

[1] J. Maldacena, "Large N field theories, string theory and gravity," *Prepared for ICTP Spring School on Superstrings and Related Matters, Trieste, Italy, 2-10 Apr 2001.*

[2] H. Cho, M. Emam, D. Kastor and J. Traschen, "Calibrations and Fayyazuddin-Smith spacetimes," Phys. Rev. D **63**, 064003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0009062].

[3] D. Kastor, "From wrapped M-branes to Calabi-Yau black holes and strings," JHEP **0307**, 040 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0305261].

[4] D. Martelli and J. Sparks, "G-structures, fluxes and calibrations in M-theory," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 085014 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0306225].

[5] A. Fayyazuddin and T. Z. Husain, "The geometry of M-branes wrapping special Lagrangian cycles," Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 7245 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0505182].

[6] M. H. Emam, "Five dimensional 2-branes from special Lagrangian wrapped M5-branes," Phys. Rev. D **71**, 125020 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0502112].

[7] M. H. Emam, "Wrapped M5-branes leading to five dimensional 2-branes," Phys. Rev. D **74**, 125004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0610161].

[8] K. Behrndt and W. A. Sabra, "Static N = 2 black holes for quadratic prepotentials," Phys. Lett. B **401**, 258 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9702010].

[9] W. A. Sabra, "General static N = 2 black holes," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **12**, 2585 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9703101].

[10] W. A. Sabra, "Black holes in N = 2 supergravity theories and harmonic functions," Nucl. Phys. B **510**, 247 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9704147].

[11] K. Behrndt, D. Lust and W. A. Sabra, "Stationary solutions of N = 2 supergravity," Nucl. Phys. B **510**, 264 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9705169].

[12] W. A. Sabra, "General BPS black holes in five dimensions," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 239 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9708103].

[13] K. Behrndt, M. Cvetic and W. A. Sabra, "The entropy of near-extreme N = 2 black holes," Phys. Rev. D **58**, 084018 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9712221].

[14] K. Behrndt, G. Lopes Cardoso, B. de Wit, D. Lust, T. Mohaupt and W. A. Sabra, "Higher-order black-hole solutions in N = 2 supergravity and Calabi-Yau string backgrounds," Phys. Lett. B **429**, 289 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9801081].

[15] K. Behrndt, A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra, "BPS black holes in N = 2 five dimensional AdS supergravity," Phys. Lett. B **442**, 97 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9807187].

[16] K. Behrndt, C. Herrmann, J. Louis and S. Thomas, "Domain walls in five dimensional supergravity with non-trivial hypermultiplets," JHEP **0101**, 011 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0008112].

[17] A. Ceresole, G. Dall'Agata, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, "Hypermultiplets, domain walls and supersymmetric attractors," Phys. Rev. D **64**, 104006 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0104056].

[18] K. Behrndt and M. Cvetic, "Bent BPS domain walls of D = 5 N = 2 gauged supergravity coupled to hypermultiplets," Phys. Rev. D **65**, 126007 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0201272].

[19] S. L. Cacciatori, A. Celi and D. Zanon, "BPS equations in N = 2, D = 5 supergravity with hypermultiplets," Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 1503 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0211135].

[20] J. De Jaegher, B. de Wit, B. Kleijn and S. Vandoren, "Special geometry in hypermultiplets," Nucl. Phys. B **514**, 553 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9707262].

[21] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, "Isometries of special manifolds," [arXiv:hep-th/9505097].

[22] M. Gutperle and M. Spalinski, "Supergravity instantons and the universal hypermultiplet," JHEP **0006**, 037 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0005068].

[23] M. Gutperle and M. Spalinski, "Supergravity instantons for N = 2 hypermultiplets," Nucl. Phys. B **598**, 509 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010192].

[24] A. C. Cadavid, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, "Eleven-dimensional supergravity compactified on Calabi-Yau threefolds," Phys. Lett. B **357**, 76 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9506144].

[25] P. S. Aspinwall, "Compactification, geometry and duality: N = 2," [arXiv:hep-th/0001001].

[26] S. Ferrara, R. R. Khuri and R. Minasian, "M-Theory on a Calabi-Yau Manifold," Phys. Lett. B **375**, 81 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9602102].

[27] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, "Heterotic M-theory in five dimensions," Nucl. Phys. B **552**, 246 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9806051].

[28] G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, "Compactification of D = 11 supergravity on spaces of exceptional holonomy," Phys. Lett. B **357**, 300 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9506150].

[29] S. Ferrara and S. Sabharwal, "Quaternionic manifolds for type II superstring vacua of Calabi-Yau spaces," Nucl. Phys. B **332**, 317 (1990).

[30] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, "Geometry of type II superstrings and the moduli of superconformal field theories," Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4**, 2475 (1989).

[31] M. H. Emam, "Calibrated brane solutions of M-theory," [arXiv:hep-th/0410100].

[32] A. Kaya, "A note on a relation between the Killing spinor and Einstein equations," Phys. Lett. B **458**, 267 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9902010].

[33] J. T. Liu and W. A. Sabra, "Multi-centered black holes in gauged D = 5 supergravity," Phys. Lett. B **498**, 123 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010025].

[34] K. Becker, M. Becker and A. Strominger, "Five-Branes, Membranes And Nonperturbative String Theory," Nucl. Phys. B **456**, 130 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9507158].

[35] K. Becker and M. Becker, "Instanton action for type II hypermultiplets," Nucl. Phys. B **551**, 102 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9901126].

[36] M. Davidse, M. de Vroome, U. Theis and S. Vandoren, "Instanton solutions for the universal hypermultiplet," Fortsch. Phys. **52**, 696 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0309220].

[37] M. Davidse, U. Theis and S. Vandoren, "Fivebrane instanton corrections to the universal hypermultiplet," Nucl. Phys. B **697**, 48 (2004) [Erratum-ibid. B **750**, 108 (2006)] [arXiv:hep-th/0404147].

[38] V. Cortes, C. Mayer, T. Mohaupt and F. Saueressig, JHEP **0506**, 025 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0503094].

[39] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and S. Panda, "Four-dimensional high-branes as intersecting D-branes," Phys. Lett. B **390**, 143 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9609056].

[40] J. M. Izquierdo, N. D. Lambert, G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, "Dyonic Membranes," Nucl. Phys. B **460**, 560 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9508177].

[41] M. B. Green, N. D. Lambert, G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, "Dyonic p-branes from self-dual (p+1)-branes," Phys. Lett. B **384**, 86 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9605146].

[42] S. V. Ketov, "Universal hypermultiplet metrics," Nucl. Phys. B **604**, 256 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0102099].

[43] J. Bellorin, P. Meessen and T. Ortin, "All the supersymmetric solutions of N = 1, d = 5 ungauged supergravity," [arXiv:hep-th/0610196].